



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/641,031	08/16/2000	Arvind A. Raichur	30874-UT	3761
5179	7590	11/02/2004	EXAMINER	
PEACOCK MYERS AND ADAMS P C P O BOX 26927 ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87125-6927			SMITH, PETER J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/641,031	RAICHUR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter J Smith	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 6/14/2004.
2. The rejection of claims 17-24 under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn in light of amended claim 17.
3. The rejection of claims 1, 7-8, 9, 15-16, 17, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maarek et al., "WebCutter: a system for dynamic and tailorabile site mapping", Computer Networks and ISDN Systems 29, 1997 has been withdrawn.
4. The rejection of claims 2-6, 10-14, and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maarek et al., "WebCutter: a system for dynamic and tailorabile site mapping", Computer Networks and ISDN Systems 29, 1997 in view of Martinez et al., US 6,271,846 B1 filed 09/30/1998 has been withdrawn.
5. Claims 1-24 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
7. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain, US 6,480,853 B1 filed 3/8/1999 in view of Chen, US 6,349,307 B1 filed 12/28/1998.

Regarding independent claims 1, 9, and 17, Jain teaches a search engine server which creates a custom search index to hypertext transmission protocol pages using a user's bookmarks

in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. Bookmarks employ a hierarchical plurality of topic categories to organize the stored links. Jain does not teach permitting a user to specify any subset of the plurality of topic categories and adding to a hypertext transmission protocol page controlled by the user link information permitting execution of searches of the index server in any category of the subset but only of categories of the subset.

Chen does teach permitting a user to specify any subset of a plurality of topic categories and adding to a hypertext transmission protocol page controlled by the user link information permitting execution of searches of an index server in any category of the subset but of categories in the subset in col. 9 line 47 – col. 10 line 13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Jain to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to used the topic category selection search of Chen to have modified and improved Jain so that the user could have automatically filtered out topic categories for which they know no useful results would have been obtained. It would have allowed the user more control in the search process and enabled a better search result.

Regarding dependent claims 2, 10, 18, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. A user can propose addition of a hypertext transmission protocol page to the bookmarks in conjunction with one or more categories of the subset and automatically adding the proposed page to the index server when the bookmarks URLs are uploaded to the index server.

Art Unit: 2176

The index is private for the user and thus other users will not search the proposed page, even if using the search engine server to search other topic categories.

Regarding dependent claims 3, 11, 19, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. Jain does not teach verifying a that a uniform resource locator address for the proposed page is valid and that the proposed page is not already indexed under the proposed one or more categories. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Jain in view of Chen so that it could have verified proposed pages and proposed categories so that the index would not have been redundant. This would have made the search engine more efficient.

Regarding dependent claims 4, 12, 20, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. Jain does not teach that the custom created search index is sharable with other users. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Jain in view of Chen to have allowed other users to have searched the proposed page when searching one or more of the proposed one or more categories to have allowed the search index users to have shared their proposed pages and increased the breadth of their searches by borrowing the URL index additions of other users.

Regarding dependent claims 5, 13, 21, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. A user can rename one or more categories of a subset of bookmarks. Therefore, Jain

teaches allowing the user to rename one or more categories of the subset as it will appear on the hypertext transmission protocol page controlled by the user.

Regarding dependent claims 6, 14, 22, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. A user can rearrange one or more categories of a subset of bookmarks. Therefore, Jain teaches allowing a user to rearrange hierarchicalization of one or more categories of the subset as it will appear on the hypertext transmission protocol page controlled by the user.

Regarding dependent claims 7, 15, 23, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. Chen teaches permitting a user to specify any subset of a plurality of topic categories in col. 9 line 47 – col. 10 line 13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Jain to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to used the topic category selection search of Chen to have modified and improved Jain so that the user could have automatically filtered out topic categories for which they know no useful results would have been obtained. It would have allowed the user more control in the search process and enabled a better search result.

Regarding dependent claims 8, 16, 24, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. Chen teaches permitting a user to specify any subset of a plurality of topic categories in col. 9 line 47 – col. 10 line 13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Jain to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to used the topic category selection search

of Chen to have modified and improved Jain so that the user could have automatically filtered out topic categories for which they know no useful results would have been obtained. It would have been obvious and desirable to have dynamically updated the link information to correspond to the new subset. It would have allowed the user more control in the search process and enabled a better search result.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments, see pages 7-11, filed 6/14/2004, with respect to the rejections of claims 1, 7-8, 9, 15-16, 17, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maarek et al., "WebCutter: a system for dynamic and tailorabile site mapping", Computer Networks and ISDN Systems 29, 1997 and claims 2-6, 10-14, and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maarek et al., "WebCutter: a system for dynamic and tailorabile site mapping", Computer Networks and ISDN Systems 29, 1997 in view of Martinez et al., US 6,271,846 B1 filed 09/30/1998 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly found prior art.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Li et al., US 6,631,496 B1 filed 3/22/1999 discloses personalizing, organizing, and managing web information. It provides a hypermedia database for managing bookmarks, which allows a user to organize hypertext documents for querying, navigating, sharing, and viewing.

Art Unit: 2176

Adams et al., US 6,334,145 B1 filed 6/30/1998 discloses storing and classifying selectable web page links and sublinks thereof to a predetermined depth. Horowitz et al., US 6,236,987 B1 filed 4/3/1998 discloses dynamic content organization in information retrieval systems.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
October 26, 2004



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER